

**Remarks**

Claims 6, 7, 10-30 are pending. Claims 6 and 15 have been amended. Claims 5, 8, and 9 have been cancelled.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 15 has been amended to address the Examiner's rejections. No new matter has been added.

**Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103**

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jeske, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,443. Claims 7, 10, 12-15, and 17-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeske. Claims 8, 9, 11, 16, and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeske in view of Greer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,048. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in part.

As noted above, claims 5, 8, and 9 have been cancelled.

Claim 6 has been amended to include several limitations similar to limitations presented in claims 8 and 9. Jeske and Greer taken alone or in combination neither teach nor suggest a method for processing requests from a computer network including:

determining a character set, the character set including the character set used by the requesting computer, wherein the determining further comprises:

receiving a predefined character from the requesting computer;

reading a table, the table including a plurality of character codes and corresponding language codes; and

matching the predefined character to one of the plurality of character codes, the matching determining one of the plurality of language codes;

as required by independent claim 6.

Regarding several limitations similar to limitations presented in claims 8 and 9, the Examiner refers generally to column 2-7 of Greer and states "Greer discloses that a character set used by the client is determined by looking up a definition table using the character set code used by the client for look up and transcoding character sets

accordingly." Office Action of July 17, 2003, p. 7, ¶2. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, the applicant respectfully submits that the particular parts of the cited reference that the Examiner has relied upon have not been designated as nearly as practicable, and the pertinence of the reference has not been clearly explained, both as required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c)(2). *See also* MPEP § 706.02(j). Specifically, the Examiner broadly refers to *7 columns* of Greer without pointing to any specific elements taught or suggested by Greer. Nevertheless, the applicant has made every effort to respond to the rejections outlined by the Examiner.

Second, the Examiner's above quoted statement finds no support in Greer. Nowhere does Greer teach or suggest "... that a character set used by the client is determined by *looking up a definition table using [a] character set code . . .*" There is absolutely no teaching or suggestion in Greer related to the use of a "definition table."

Third, Greer does not teach or suggest the applicant's claim limitations "reading a table, the table including a plurality of character codes and corresponding language codes," and "matching the predefined character to one of the plurality of character codes, the matching determining one of the plurality of language codes." To the contrary, Greer simply teaches that "[t]he GET request may also specify a character set that should be used when the proxy server responds to the get request. Thus, the mobile computing device can override the session character set." Column 6, lines 62-64. Similarly, Greer's step **450**, where the transcoder "will test to see if the character set used in the response is the same character set used by the mobile computing device" (Column 7, lines 10-12), does not teach or suggest the applicant's claim elements.

Finally, in combining Jeske and Greer, the Examiner states that "[i]t would have been obvious . . . to modify Jeske in view of Greer so that character set transformation is affected. One would be motivated to do so to allow universally located clients access to hosted data in a network." Office Action of July 17, 2003, p. 7, ¶3. The applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In addition to the claim elements not taught or suggested by the cited references as described above, the Examiner has not shown that there is some suggestion

or motivation to combine Jeske and Greer, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Neither reference suggests such a combination. Moreover, the applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to explain what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested the combination, as required by, for example, *In re Rouffet*, 47 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1998). The Examiner's purported reason for combination, "to allow universally located clients access to hosted data in a network," can be adequately satisfied or achieved taking either reference alone, and thus there is no real motivation to combine the references.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is allowable over Jeske and Greer taken alone or in combination. Claim 7 depends from claim 6 and is allowable for at least this reason.

Regarding independent claims 10, 22, and 23, the applicant respectfully submits that Jeske neither teaches nor suggests a method for processing requests from a computer network including:

- receiving a data stream from the computer network;
- identifying a template within the data stream; [and]
- searching a registration table, the searching programmed to locate department logic corresponding to the template;

as required by independent claim 10, and generally required by independent claims 22 and 23.

Regarding the applicant's claim limitations, the Examiner refers generally to column 3-5 of Jeske and states "Jeske discloses a browser request is received by a CGIG process on the server and using a virtual application process 107, an HTML template is defined and populated with data to form a responsive web page." Office Action of July 17, 2003, p. 4, ¶7.

Column 3, lines 60-63 of Jeske state "The dynamic capability of this system is that the virtual application 107 defines an HTML template file. An HTML template file is an HTML document that has defined specific areas in the document that will be dynamically filled in." However, there is no teaching or suggestion that Jeske's template

is received as part of a data stream from a computer network or identified within that data stream, as the applicants claim. Furthermore, there is nothing in Jeske teaching or suggesting that a registration table be searched to locate department logic corresponding to the template. In fact, the Examiner makes no effort to identify something from Jeske that teaches or suggests this limitation.

Accordingly, the applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 10, 22, and 23 are allowable over Jeske. Claims 11-21 depend from claim 10 and are allowable for at least this reason. Claims 24-30 depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least this reason.

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, on Oct 17, 2003.

  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

10/17/03  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Marc R. Ascolese  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 42,268  
512-439-5085  
512-439-5099 (fax)